

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1 and 3-10 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 3-10 are rejected.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 9

Claims 1, 3-5 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over previously cited Morris in view of previously cited Nieuwenhuizen.

Regarding claims 1, 4 and 5, Morris discloses a starting source for arc discharge lamps. In one embodiment, the starting source includes a cavity (50) in the press seal (42) of the arc tube (40), encompassing a portion (51) of Mo foil (44). An external ground plane (54) adjacent to the cavity (50) forms a capacitive coupling with the foil (44). See col. 3, lines 31-45 of the reference.

The cavity (50) is formed by drilling a hole or forming an indentation in a press foot prior to formation of the press seal. See col. 3, lines 56-60.

In another embodiment, the ground plane (64) is in the form of a U-shaped conductor, attached to the outside of the press seal (42), or mounted close to the press seal (42). See col. 4, lines 33-36.

Morris does not teach or suggest a ground plane in the form of a wire which is wound around the seal, or a resilient body which clamps itself partially around the seal.

Moreover, Morris does not teach or suggest forming the cavity by means of a collapsed seal.

Nieuwenhuizen is cited to show an external capacitive body in the form of a wire wound around the seal, citing page 4, line 31 through page 5, line 2 and Fig. 3 of the reference.

However, Nieuwenhuizen specifically shows both the first and second external (wire) antennas (42, 45) electrically

connected to the second electrode (40) by conductor (46). See Fig. 3 of the reference.

Thus, Nieuwenhuizen fails to teach or suggest the invention, since claim 1 specifically calls for the wire to be electrically isolated from the first and second electrodes.

Since Morris does not teach or suggest a structure in which a capacitive body in the form of a wire is electrically isolated from the first and second electrodes, whereas Nieuwenhuizen specifically shows both the first and second external (wire) antennas (42, 45) electrically connected to the second electrode (40) by conductor (46), the combination of Morris and Nieuwenhuizen fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 3 and 9, while not conceding the patentability per se of these claims, they are nevertheless patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 3-5 and 9 under section 103(a) over Morris in view of Nieuwenhuizen is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 7

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris and Nieuwenhuizen as applied to claim 1, further in view of previously cited Kawashima.

Without conceding the patentability per se of claims 6 and 7, these claims are patentable by reason of their dependency upon, and incorporation of the limitations of, claims 1 and 6, respectively.

Accordingly, claims 6 and 7 are patentable over the combination of Morris, Nieuwenhuizen and Kawashima, and the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 10

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris and Nieuwenhuizen as applied to claim 1, further in view of previously cited Adamson.


Without conceding the patentability per se of claims 8 and 10, these claims are patentable by reason of their dependency upon, and incorporation of the limitations of, claims 6 and 8, respectively.

Accordingly, claims 8 and 10 are patentable over the combination of Morris, Nieuwenhuizen and Adamson, and the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) is in error and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be otherwise in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
315-828-6292